

## REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the personal interview conducted with Applicant's undersigned representative on Monday, October 26, 2010. At the interview, Applicant's representative explained the invention as described in the specification and further explained how amended independent claims 1, 9, 10, and 11 distinguished over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/012202 (Nagashima), 6,751,352 (Baharav et al.), and U.S. Patent No. 5,227,893 (Ett), as further discussed below. The Examiner indicated he understood Applicant's position but that further search and consideration would be necessary.

Claims 1-11 remain pending, with claims 1 and 9-11 being independent. Claims 1 and 9-11 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure. Thus, Applicant submits that the amendments do not include new matter.

Claims 1, 2 and 6-11 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nagashima in combination with Baharav et al. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nagashima in combination with Ett.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, a registration unit configured to register both application data and print data generated from the application data in a database with a specific index, wherein the application data and the print data are associated with each other by the specific index.

Once the application data and the print data are associated with each other by the specific index, a scanning unit, as also recited in independent claim 1, can scan in a printed material with a predetermined code. Independent claim 1 further recites an index input unit that can analyze the predetermined code and input the specific index corresponding to the analyzed predetermined code. Then, based on the specific index determine by the index input unit, a selecting unit selects either the application data or the print data from the specific index. Therefore, in the combination recited in independent claim 1, the application data and the print data are stored together, via a specific index, and the selecting unit can determine based on the specific index whether to use application data or print data. Amended independent claims 9-11 recite analogous features.

In sum, the claimed invention includes a *combination* of features related to print data, and application data generated from the print data, registered together in a database with a specific index.

The cited reference to Nagashima relates to an information processing apparatus capable of improving the operability in producing a coversheet in which plural information is written. Nagashima discloses, among other things, an information management database 1073 that stores Registration File A and Registration File B. See Fig. 2. Figures 6 and 7 show the structure of generated coversheet templates stored in Registration Files A and B. Thus, as shown by Figures 2, 6, and 7, collectively, Registration Files A and B are merely storing a plurality of templates, and each template is stored separately with a separate File ID and location.

The Office Action asserts that the coversheet template includes application and printing data as in the claimed invention, citing paragraphs [0032] and [0063] of Nagashima.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Paragraph [0032] is merely a brief description of Figure 3, which shows a flow chart showing the procedure for generating printing data with a coversheet. On the other hand, at paragraph [0063] Nagashima discusses producing a template for a coversheet. Obviously, the template for the coversheet is what may be used for generating a coversheet with the print data in the process shown in Figure 3.

These combined portions of disclosure in Nagashima clearly fall well short of inputting application data, and then inputting print data generated by converting the application data, and registering both the application data and the print data with a specific index, as recited in the claimed invention. Indeed, in this disclosure of Nagashima only one type of data is input - the coversheet template. And as noted above, the templates are stored in the registration files shown in Figure 2. That a template stored in the registration file is subsequently used to output a coversheet with further printing data (Figure 3) is irrelevant with respect to the claimed invention of inputting two types of data, and registering those two types of data with a specific index.

Accordingly, Nagashima fails to disclose or suggest at least a registration unit configured to register both application data, and print data generated from the application data, in a database with a specific index, wherein the application data and the print data being associated with each other by the specific index, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Applicant further submits that the secondary citations to Baharav et al. and Ett do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Nagashima. Baharav et al. is cited in the Office Action as disclosing a scanning unit and Ett is cited in the Office Action as disclosing a pseudo code bar. Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, Applicant submits that neither Baharav et al. nor Ett teach or suggest the features lacking in Nagashima, as discussed above. In particular, neither Baharav et al. nor Ett teaches or suggests a registration unit configured to register both

application data and print data generated from the application data in a database with a specific index, wherein the application data and the print data being associated with each other by the specific index, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Nagashima, Baharav et al., and Ett, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Applicant further submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the application are earnestly solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

---

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DHH:MW